

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1 have been amended. Claim 29 has been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-28 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTION – 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claim 1 was rejected as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 as being indefinite be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – CLAIMS 1, 10-12, 14 AND 24-27

Claims 1, 10-12, 14 and 24-27 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,110,799 issued to Willins, et al. (*Willins*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,826,174 issued to Erekson, et al. (*Erekson*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 10-12 14 and 24-27 are not rendered obvious by *Willins* and *Erekson*.

Claim 1 recites:

- detecting an event associated with a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) call;
- determining whether an external speaker system separate from a speaker internal to the computing device is directly physically connected to the stereo output interface via the first and third portions;
- determining whether a second external speaker system separate from the speaker internal to the computing device is connected to the output interface via the second and third portions; and
- generating, selectively, a predetermined event announcement signal based on the determination of whether the event announcement device is the external speaker system or the in-the-car speaker system.

Thus, Applicants claim providing event announcement via one or two external speaker systems coupled with a stereo interface.

Neither *Willins* nor *Erekson* teach or suggest event announcement as recited in the claims. Further, Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Willins* does not disclose management of VoIP calls. *Erekson* discloses a system in which VoIP calls are routed to a traditional wireless telephone handset, for example, a 900 MHz handset. See Abstract. While *Erekson* discloses use of PDAs, the PDAs are for routing of VoIP calls to the traditional telephone handset. See col. 5, lines 60-65 and col. 6, lines 45-50. The PDA is not for making and receiving calls as recited in the claims. That is, the PDA in *Erekson* performs a different function than the electronic device in the claims. Further, the VoIP call is handled in a different manner than recited in the claims. Therefore, no combination of *Willins* and *Erekson* can teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 1 and 14.

Claims 10-12 depend from claim 1. Claims 24-27 depend from claim 14. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 10-12 and 24-27 are not rendered obvious by *Willins* and *Erekson* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 2, 15 and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* and *Erekson* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,150 issued to DeLadurantaye (*DeLadurantaye*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 2, 15 and 23 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *Erekson* and *DeLadurantaye*.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and claim 23 depends from claim 15. *DeLadurantaye* is cited to teach a headset receptacle jack. See

Office Action at page 4. However, whether or not *DeLadurantaye* discloses the headset receptacle jack, *DeLadurantaye* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins* and *Erekson* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins*, *Erekson* and *DeLadurantaye* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 2, 15 and 23.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 16, 17 and 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* and *Erekson* and *DeLadurantaye* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0196249 of Roberts (*Roberts*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 6, 16, 17 and 19 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts*.

Claims 3, 4 and 6 depend from claim 1. Claims 16, 17 and 19 depend from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins*, *Erekson* and *DeLadurantaye* do not teach or suggest the invention as recited in the claims discussed above. *Roberts* is cited to teach a stereo jack. However, whether or not *Roberts* discloses the stereo jack, *Roberts* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins* and *DeLadurantaye* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 3, 4, 6, 16, 17 and 19.

Claims 5 and 18 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* and *Erekson* in view of *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,889,843 issued to Singer, et al. (*Singer*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 18 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts* and *Singer*.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 18 depends from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* do not teach or suggest the

invention as recited in the claims discussed above. *Singer* is cited to teach in-ear headphones. See Office Action at page 10. However, whether or not *Singer* discloses the in-ear headphones, *Singer* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts* and *Singer* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 5 and 18.

Claims 7 and 20 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins*, *Erekson* and *DeLadurantaye* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,653,934 issued to Pan, et al. (*Pan*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 20 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Pan*.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and claim 20 depends from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins*, *Erekson* and *DeLadurantaye* do not teach or suggest the invention as recited in the claims discussed above. *Pan* is cited to teach buzzers. See Office Action at page 12. However, whether or not *Pan* discloses the buzzers, *Pan* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins*, *Erekson* and *DeLadurantaye* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Pan* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 7 and 20.

Claims 8 and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* and *Erekson* in view of *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* and further in view of *Pan*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 21 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts* and *Pan*.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and claim 21 depends from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* do not teach or suggest the

invention as recited in the claims discussed above. *Pan* is cited to teach buzzers. See Office Action at page 13. However, whether or not *Pan* discloses the buzzers, *Pan* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts* and *Pan* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 8 and 21.

Claims 9 and 22 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* and *Erekson* in view of *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts*, *Singer* and *Pan*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 9 and 22 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts*, *Singer* and *Pan*.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and claim 22 depends from claim 14. As discussed above, *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* do not teach or suggest the invention as recited in the claims discussed above. *Pan* is cited to teach buzzers. See Office Action at page 17. However, whether or not *Pan* discloses the buzzers, *Pan* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye* and *Roberts* set forth above. Therefore, no combination of *Willins*, *Erekson*, *DeLadurantaye*, *Roberts* and *Pan* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 9 and 22.

Claims 26 and 27 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Willins* and *Erekson* in view of *Pan*. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 26 and 27 are not rendered obvious by *Willins*, *Erekson* and *Pan*.

Claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 14. *Pan* is cited to teach buzzers. See Office Action at page 12. However, whether or not *Pan* discloses the buzzers, *Pan* does not cure the deficiencies of *Willins* and *Erekson* set forth above. Therefore, no

combination of *Willins*, *Erekson* and *Pan* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 26 and 27.

Claim 29 was rejected as being unpatentable over *DeLadurantaye* and *Erekson*.

Claim 29 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 29 is moot.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-28 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: October 14, 2008

/Paul A. Mendonsa/
Paul A. Mendonsa
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778